

Appl. No. : 10/630,635
Filed : July 29, 2003

REMARKS

The August 22, 2006 Office Action was based upon pending Claims 2-7, 9-12, 14-16, 23-29, 31-35, 37 and 39-48. The Amendment amends Claims 2, 10, 23, 31, 37, and 44. Thus, after entry of this amendment, Claims 2-7, 9-12, 14-16, 23-29, 31-35, 37, and 39-48 are pending and presented for further consideration.

The August 22, 2006 Office Action rejected Claims 2-7, 9-12, 14-16, 23-29, 31-35, 37 and 39-48. In particular, the Office Action rejected Claims 2-7, 9-12, 14-16, 23-29, 31, 33-35, 37, 39-42 and 44-48 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 5,333,276 to Solari ("the Solari patent") in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,644,729 to Amini et al. ("the Amini patent"). Further, the Office Action rejected Claims 32 and 43 as being unpatentable over Solari in view of Amini and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,664,122 to Rabe et al. ("the Rabe patent").

REJECTION OF CLAIMS 2-7, 9-12, 14-16, 23-29, 31,33-35, 37, 39-42 and 44-48 UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)

The Examiner rejected Claims 2-7, 9-12, 14-16, 23-29, 31, 33-35, 37, 39-42 and 44-48 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Solari in view of Amini.

Claim 2

Neither Solari nor Amini, alone or in combination, teach reading status information from the first address buffer to determine a priority status of the first data value; reading status information from the second address buffer to determine the priority status of the second data value; and controlling the order of bi-directional data flow through the first and second bi-directional data buffers based on the priority status of the first and second data values.

In contrast, an embodiment buffers a first address with a first address buffer and a second address with a second address buffer, buffers a first data value with a first bi-directional data buffer and buffers a second data value with a second bi-directional data buffer; reads status information from the first address buffer to determine a priority status of the first data value; reads status information from the second address buffer to determine the priority status of the second data value; and controls the order of bi-directional data flow through the first and second bi-directional data buffers, wherein

Appl. No. : **10/630,635**
Filed : **July 29, 2003**

controlling the order of the bi-directional data flow through the first and second bi-directional data buffers is based on a the priority status of the first and second data values.

Because the references cited by the Examiner do not disclose, teach or suggest reading status information from the first address buffer to determine a priority status of the first data value; reading status information from the second address buffer to determine the priority status of the second data value; and controlling the order of bi-directional data flow through the first and second bi-directional data buffers based on the priority status of the first and second data values, along with the other recitations of independent Claim 2, Applicant asserts that Claim 2 is not obvious in view of Solari and Amini, alone or in combination. Applicant therefore respectfully submits that Claim 2 is patentably distinguished over the cited references and Applicant respectfully requests allowance of Claim 2.

Claims 3-7 and 9

Claims 3-7 and 9, which depend from Claim 2, are believed to be patentable for the same reasons articulated above with respect to Claim 2, and because of the additional features recited therein.

Claim 10

Although Claim 10 has different language than Claim 1, Claim 10 is believed to be patentable for similar reasons (where applicable), and because of the different features recited therein.

Claims 11, 12, 14, 15, and 16

Claims 11, 12, 14, 15 and 16, which depend from Claim 10, are believed to be patentable for the same reasons articulated above with respect to Claim 10, and because of the additional features recited therein.

Claim 23

Although Claim 23 has different language than Claim 1, Claim 23 is believed to be patentable for similar reasons (where applicable), and because of the different features recited therein.

Appl. No. : **10/630,635**
Filed : **July 29, 2003**

Claims 24-29

Claims 24-29, which depend from Claim 23, are believed to be patentable for the same reasons articulated above with respect to Claim 23, and because of the additional features recited therein.

Claim 31

Although Claim 31 has different language than Claim 1, Claim 31 is believed to be patentable for similar reasons (where applicable), and because of the different features recited therein.

Claims 33-35

Claims 33-35, which depend from Claim 31, are believed to be patentable for the same reasons articulated above with respect to Claim 31, and because of the additional features recited therein.

Claim 37

Although Claim 37 has different language than Claim 1, Claim 37 is believed to be patentable for similar reasons (where applicable), and because of the different features recited therein.

Claims 39-42

Claims 39-42, which depend from Claim 37, are believed to be patentable for the same reasons articulated above with respect to Claim 37, and because of the additional features recited therein.

Claim 44

Although Claim 44 has different language than Claim 1, Claim 44 is believed to be patentable for similar reasons (where applicable), and because of the different features recited therein.

Claims 45-48

Claims 45-48, which depend from Claim 44, are believed to be patentable for the same reasons articulated above with respect to Claim 44, and because of the additional features recited therein.

Appl. No. : 10/630,635
Filed : July 29, 2003

REJECTION OF CLAIMS 32 and 43 UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)

The Examiner rejected Claims 32 and 43 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Solari in view of Amini and further in view of Rabe.

Claim 32, which depends from Claim 31, and Claim 43, which depends from Claim 23, are believed to be patentable for the same reasons articulated above with respect to Claims 31 and 23, respectively, and because of the additional features recited therein.

CONCLUSION

Although amendments and cancellations have been made, no acquiescence or estoppel is or should be implied thereby. Rather, the amendments and cancellations are made only to expedite prosecution of the present application, and without prejudice to presentation or assertion, in the future, of claims on the subject matter affected thereby. Furthermore, any arguments in support of patentability and based on a portion of a claim should not be taken as founding patentability solely on the portion in question; rather, it is the combination of features or acts recited in a claim which distinguishes it over the prior art.

In view of the foregoing, the present application is believed to be in condition for allowance, and such allowance is respectfully requested. If further issues remain to be resolved, the Examiner is cordially invited to contact the undersigned such that any remaining issues may be promptly resolved. Also, please charge any additional fees, including any fees for additional extension of time, or credit overpayment to Deposit Account No. 11-1410.

Respectfully submitted,

KNOBBE, MARTENS, OLSON & BEAR, LLP

Dated: 11/20/00

By: Karen J. Jenker
Karen J. Jenker
Registration No. 54,618
Agent of Record
Customer No. 20,995
(949) 760-0404